

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and following comments is courteously solicited.

Claim 1, 11, 18, 26, 32, 38, 39, 42, 45 and 46 have been amended so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as set forth on page 2 of the Examiner's action. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims as pending comply with the formal requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 1 has been amended so as to point out with specificity the details of the conveying device and its function. It is submitted that amended independent claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

With regard to GB 783,881 the following should be noted. The '881 document does not teach, disclose, suggest or render obvious a conveying device as claimed in amended independent claim 1. What the '881 document does show is a series of sealing elements arranged in a row; however, the sealing devices do not constitute a conveying device which generates a pressure difference between the partial areas (96<sub>a</sub>) and (96<sub>b</sub>) as now claimed in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably defines over the '881 document.

With regard to U.S. Patent 4,561,679, the following should be noted. The '679 document does not show the use of an auxiliary liquid in area (96) which liquid is different from the liquid to be sealed. Furthermore, the '679 document does not teach a conveying device for subdividing the area which contains the auxiliary liquid (H) into two partial areas (96<sub>a</sub>) and (96<sub>b</sub>) wherein the conveying device is arranged within the partial

areas. The '679 document teaches an external pressure means which is different from the now claimed conveying device within the partial areas as claimed in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 1 as amended clearly defines over the '679 document.

With regard to U.S. 5,217,233, this document does not teach an area for an auxiliary liquid as claimed in independent claim 1. Furthermore, the sealing elements in the '233 document allow for at least some leakage. The sealing elements of the present invention as defined in independent claim 1 are leakage-free. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 1 as amended defines over the '233 document.

Finally, with regard to U.S. 6,132,168, the following should be noted. The '168 document does not appear to teach a conveying device for generating a pressure within the partial areas (96<sub>a</sub>) and (96<sub>b</sub>). The '168 patent clearly does not show such a conveying device arranged within the partial areas (96<sub>a</sub>) and (96<sub>b</sub>). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably defines over the '168 document.

Applicant submits herewith new independent claims 47 and 48. Independent claim 47 contains all the limitations of independent claim 1 discussed above, and therefore, is believed to be patentable over the cited documents for the reasons set forth hereinabove. In addition to the foregoing, independent claim 47 sets forth magnetofluidic sealing elements wherein at least one of the magnetofluidic sealing elements delimits the area (96) for the auxiliary liquid (H). This additional feature is not at all shown by the prior art references. Accordingly, it is believed that independent claim 47 clearly defines over the prior art.

With regard to independent claim 48, independent claim 48

includes all the limitations of amended independent claim 1 as discussed above and accordingly is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for the same reasons set forth above with regard to amended independent claim 1. In addition to the foregoing, new independent claim 48 sets forth the further limitation that the pressure difference generated by the conveying means corresponds at least to the maximum pressure difference which occurs between the claimed fluids(A, B). This feature is not at all shown in the prior art.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims as pending patentably define over the art of record and the early issuance of a formal notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Gregory P. LaPointe #28395/  
Gregory P. LaPointe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 28,395

Telephone: 203-777-6628  
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: July 20, 2009